


The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., NOVEMBER 24, 1904. No. 45.

MODERN BIOLOGY AND THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION.*)

HE latest work of the famous biologist, E. Wasmann, S. J., is of vast importance, as well as of absorbing interest for every educated Catholic. There is prevailing a strong tendency now-a-days, with a certain class of writers, to widen the supposed chasm between faith and science, and to spread among the people the dangerous belief that science and faith are incompatibles, and that, in consequence, faith is fast disappearing in the noon-day light of science.

P. Wasmann undertakes the task of showing that this is a mistake. Choosing for his motto the dictum of the Vatican Council: "Nulla unquam inter fidem et rationem vera dissensio esse potest," he studies with unremitting zeal the most modern works on biological subjects, deeply enters by original research-work of rare ingenuity into the most momentous problems involved, contributes numerous treatises to the existing biological literature, always harmonizing or contrasting, as the case may be, his own results with those of other leading scientists, and finally proceeds to write the work before us, a work calculated to convince every unbiased mind that the splendid results of modern biological research are in perfect agreement with the Christian conception of life and the world.

Wasmann's latest work naturally falls into two main parts: Modern Cytology†] (p. 1-166), and the Theory of Evolution (p. 167-360).

*) Die moderne Biologie und die Entwicklungstheorie, von Erich Wasmann, S. J. Zweite vermehrte Auflage. Mit 40 Abbildungen im Text und 4 Tafeln in Farbendruck und Autotypie, gr. 8° (XII, 326), Freiburg im Breisgau, Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1904.

†) Kúros [hollow], taken from the cell's appearance under the microscope.

The first two chapters explain the definitions of biology and its principal subdivisions, including their history from Aristotle and Albertus Magnus down to Anton Leeuwenhoek (1632-1723), the "father of microscopy," and the latest cytologists, who have revealed to us the wonderful microcosm of the cell. There follows a thorough and interesting description of the cell itself, of its morphology and physiology, of the remarkable laws of indirect cell-division, of the important connection of these laws with the growth and propagation of individuals, as well as with the problems of heredity.

The essential constituents of every animal and vegetable cell are two substances, the one called "protoplasm" (or cytoplasm), the other "nucleus," both of which complement each other in the most essential functions of life. The principal share, however, of life's activity is due to the nucleus. The nucleus, in fact, and especially its chromatin,*) is, as it were, the central station of all the phenomena of life. They direct and determine the activity of the perfected cell, its motion as well as its nutrition and augmentation. Especially are they of great importance for the beginning of organic life, which depends on the division and augmentation of cells. The nucleus and its chromatin are the material instruments of transmission in the world of living beings, they are the visible substratum of organic creative power.

The closing chapter of the first part is devoted to the cell and primo-genesis, and serves at the same time as an introduction to the second part of the whole work. Having shown that there are no living beings of a simpler organization than cells, Wasmann undermines the position of those who would assume spontaneous generation as a postulate of science.

Modern cosmology has clearly demonstrated that in the beginning the condition of our planet was such as to render the existence of living beings impossible. What, then, is the origin of the first organism? There is no effect without its adequate cause. But inorganic matter can not be the adequate cause of organic matter. It is precisely modern science that proves spontaneous generation to be contrary to fact. Hence, supposing the laws of the present to be the laws of the past, we are forced to assume a cause not identical with inorganic matter, a cause that has acted upon matter from without and produced in it the first organisms. Thus modern science postulates, not primogenesis, but the existence of a personal God.

In the eighth chapter Wasmann commences his explanation of

*) *Xpōμα* [color], taken from the fact that this substance is colored when treated with certain chemical dyes.

the theory of evolution by defining the term "Darwinism." He finds that the term is used in four meanings. It may stand: 1. for Darwin's theory of natural selection; 2. for the generalization of this theory into a philosophical world-view (Haeckel's); 3. for Darwin's theory as applied to man; 4. for the theory of the evolution of organic species as opposed to that of the constancy of these species.

Wasmann unreservedly rejects Darwinism in its first three meanings, but advocates Darwinism in its fourth meaning, not however without adding some very important philosophical and scientific restrictions.

The philosophical restrictions are as follows: 1. the doctrine of creation remains untouched; 2. the human species, endowed as it is with spiritual faculties, can not come into consideration in the present question.

Here are the scientific restrictions: 1. The time of the first existence of organisms is the end of the archæan period. It is, however, impossible to decide, whether the types of the main classes were produced successively or simultaneously. 2. There is no evidence whatever of a "monophylistic"† evolution. On the contrary, it becomes more and more probable that such an evolution is directly opposed to facts. 3. Our knowledge of the causes of evolution is as yet in an imperfect state. This much, however, is certain, we have to assume not merely what is called an "external directive," but as the foundation of the evolutionary processes an intrinsic principle of development.

The first class of these restrictions is unalterable, but the second may be subject to manifold modifications.

With these restrictions, the theory of evolution belongs exclusively to the domain of the natural sciences, as it merely aims at settling a question of fact: the actual and causal relation of organic forms, past and present. In fact, it can not rest with philosophy to determine, whether an evolution of species has taken place or not, how large the number of original types must have been and in what succession they have followed each other.

The important principle which the theory of evolution makes use of is as follows: God does not by personal intervention interfere with the natural order, if he can produce the same effects through the medium of natural or secondary causes. As this principle is a fundamental part of the Christian world-view, it is calculated of itself to make the theory of descent, in preference to that of multiplied creations, but a natural consequence of the Copernican system.

†) Μόνος (single), φυλή (class or tribe, here: species.)

The ninth chapter acquaints us with the actual proofs for the theory of evolution. They are of two kinds, direct*) as well as indirect, mostly taken from Wasmann's own observations, and based upon no less than 140 essays, written by himself previous to the publication of this book. Perhaps some will be unable, or if able, will not go to the trouble of rating the value of the arguments proposed, seeing that a more than ordinary knowledge of the morphology and biology of tiny insects is necessary for their full appreciation. We are sure, however, that all readers of Wasmann's book will readily agree with the author, when at the end of his first exhaustive treatise†) on the direct proofs in favor of the theory of descent, he remarks: "If one could prove that all these facts can be accounted for as well or even better, without accepting the theory of evolution, then I admit that this theory, in the present instance at least, is not sufficiently warranted by facts. If not, no one can blame me for taking that theory as the best explanation of facts otherwise inexplicable." At any rate, if we carefully consider and really understand the array of facts observed and proposed by men like Wasmann and de Vries, together with the evidence offered by paleontology, we must confess that the idea of a saltatory specific evolution, proceeding from an intrinsic principle and guided by an external directive, is no longer a mere hypothesis, but supported by arguments of grave probability.

This conclusion is of no little import to-day, because it implies the acceptance of a principle still contradicted by some well-meaning Catholics, who find it difficult to draw the line between the harmless theory of evolution in the above restricted sense, and its counterfeit—we mean those unwarranted fictions and wild fancies of modern ultra-evolutionists. Whereas these fictions antagonize the Christian view of the world, the true theory of evolution shows forth in a more brilliant light the grandeur and power and wisdom of the Creator, who, without reiterated interventions on his part, so created matter in the beginning as to have within itself all the forces necessary for producing in the course of ages this magnificent world.

Having shown in the tenth chapter that the natural sciences have not succeeded in establishing any proof for the animal descent of man's body, the biologist Wasmann concludes his

*) Confer THE REVIEW: "Wasmann and Evolution," vol. x., p. 389-392. In this little article the reader will find the explanation of Wasmann's "systematic species" as well as the main idea of his direct argument in favor of evolution.

†) Biologisches Centralblatt, vol. xxi, p. 750.

splendid work by yielding his pen to the Christian apologist, the champion of revelation.

In spirit he sees the Christian world-view like a mighty rock in the midst of a vast ocean. Centuries of quietude had elapsed when, wellnigh 350 years ago, a terrific storm arose and the stability of the rock seemed endangered. The time-honored system of Ptolemy was supplanted by that of Copernicus, and many a pious soul began to tremble and to fear lest hostile waves should dash to pieces the foundation upon which rested their long-cherished convictions. But breaking at the foot of this rock, these turbulent waves lost their apparent hostility, and lingering ever after, they harmoniously gamboled about its foundations.

300 years later another storm arose. Waves of ever increasing volume threatened to wrench from its lodging this rock of ages. The theory of evolution was hurled against the theory of constancy, and again some tenants of that rocky isle believed the ground was crumbling beneath them, and that the Church of God, resting thereon, would totter under the shock of these overwhelming forces. But though the storm is still raging, we can confidently predict that this rock will stand firm till the dawn of eternity. The little airy bubbles of modern infidelity, still borne on the crest of the billows, will disappear, and the prouder waves themselves will soon play quietly at the foot of this unsurmountable barrier; for there can never be a contradiction between science and faith, since both spring from the mind of the same all-wise God.

We may add that Wasmann's book is written in a lucid and pleasing style. Many interesting episodes have been interwoven with the strictly scientific discussion to make even the somewhat difficult passages of the book delightful reading. The clear synopses, also, printed at the head of each section, as well as the fine illustrations, most of which are original, must be mentioned as valuable aids in the study of this truly remarkable book, which no up-to-date Christian apologist can dispense with.

H. M.

28 25 28

—When Burke declared that he did not know how to frame an indictment of a whole people, he exposed a fallacy which vitiates myriads of books. Nothing, indeed, delights men more than to generalize from insufficient evidence; we seem to increase our own importance by laying down propositions of magnificent size. "Ex uno disce omnes" is the maxim according to which judgments covering whole races are pronounced, and he who has perchance met a single Chinaman, will tell you what are the characteristics of the other four hundred millions.

THE STORY OF DR. EDWARD PREUSS' CONVERSION.

[As Told by Himself.]

XIII.

As a school-boy he had once read, and then reread, and almost learnt by heart, a little poem, which told how the heathen lansenet Offero had proudly set out to serve the most powerful master; how he first took service with an earthly king, but when he perceived that his master feared the Devil, joined the cohorts of Satan; and seeing that the Devil trembled before the holy cross, he sought Christ crucified until he found him in a most remarkable way.

When still a Protestant, our Professor had occasionally mentioned this pretty legend to his college pupils, who cared little about the god of the Lutherans; exhorting them, like Offero to serve only the most powerful master.

He himself fancied that he was serving the mightiest of all chiefs; but while he strove with all his ability to advance that master's cause, he had been, in the hands of one who was clearly a thousand times more powerful, the instrument for the accomplishment of directly opposite ends.

Who had profited by his literary activity, by his whole past life? Surely not the god of the Lutherans. If the cleverest enemy of this god had undertaken to excogitate a plan by which to injure his cause most seriously, he could not have invented a more effective combination.

But which enemy of the Lutheran god should have profited by the writings and doings of our fanatical Professor? Obviously none other than He who, in 1854, had proclaimed as a dogma of faith the Immaculate Conception of His most Blessed Mother; He who teaches his adherents to reject justification by faith alone as a pernicious error and to travel the royal highway of justification by faith and good works, as the only road to eternal life.

A Protestant controversialist is called to compose a book against the privilege of the Immaculate Conception; and three years later he lies prostrate in the dust, so utterly defeated that the victory of the detracted Virgin is clearly apparent to all the world.

The same scholar and author proves with the most powerful "Scriptural reasons" and with an enthusiasm and ardor hitherto unheard-of, that sanctification flows from the Lutheran justification as a river from its source; and three months after, all the world knows that the example given by this justified man is perfectly lamentable.

If the Almighty had desired to prove clearly and unmistakably

that it is the "ordo salutis" of the Tridentine Council, and not the revamped doctrines of ancient orthodox Lutheranism, which lead to a pure and holy life, he had evidently chosen the wisest possible course to accomplish His purpose.

Yes, the Tridentine Council!—Fortunately, our ex-Professor still owned a fine quarto edition of its decrees and canons, with explanatory notes, in which among other things there were many texts adduced from Holy Scripture.

This book he now began to study. And where the annotations of the Louvain editors seemed insufficient, he consulted Bellarmine, whose 'Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei adversus hujus Temporis Haereticos' he had once purchased in order to defend against them the dead Chemnitz. Now they had to serve the purpose of opening fully his own bedimmed eyes.

Aside from the "ordo salutis," which naturally engrossed his chief attention, our ex-Professor was intensely interested in the learned author's teaching on the Church.

In the course of his literary labors in the Lutheran seminary of St. Louis, he had drawn certain conclusions from 1 Tim. iii, 15, where St. Paul calls the Church "the pillar and ground of truth."*)

One of his learned colleagues had thereupon mildly called him to order. "If the Church were indeed the pillar of truth," said he, "the Catholics would be right. In matter of fact the opposite must be held as the teaching of Scripture: i. e., the truth is the pillar and ground of the Church."—

"But," he queried, "has not the Holy Ghost spoken differently through the mouth of the Apostle? Do we not clearly read in the passage quoted: 'How thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth'?"

"My construction," replied his colleague, "is: 'How thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church.—A pillar and ground of truth is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh.'"

The gentleman was quite right. If the Church is the pillar and ground of truth, the claims of Lutheranism are exploded.

And indeed: where was the Lutheran Church in the Middle Ages?—"With the Waldenses."—Well and good. But where was it in the four hundred years that elapsed between Charlemagne and Pope Lucius III., before there were any Waldenses?

In these unlucky centuries the pillar and ground of truth was apparently nowhere, and the truth consequently floated in the air.

No? Then you must concede that the Catholic Church with her

*) Στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας.

mass, her auricular confession, her priests and bishops, was the pillar and the foundation of truth.—

But does it not follow from all this that we have to adopt that ingenious explanation of 1 Tim. iii, 15, which was proposed to our young Lutheran Professor by his elder and more experienced colleague?

While this interpretation is no more an impossible one than the well-known rationalistic theory which explains away from 1 John v. 20, the divinity of Christ and from Is. vii, 14, the mother of the Messiah; it is rather desperate and, for a Lutheran, more than queer. For Luther himself always translated and explained 1 Tim. iii, 15, according to the plain sense of the text and in conformity with the traditional Catholic exegesis; and one of the most prominent of the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church has impressed upon it the binding seal of authority.

Even if the passage about the pillar and the ground of truth did not exist in the New Testament, the claim of the Lutheran Sion that it is the Church founded by Christ, would still remain exceedingly weak and problematical. For the Divine Savior himself has predicted that His Church would never be overcome by the gates of hell; and this prediction can certainly not be applied to a denomination which, as its own theologians are forced to admit, for centuries did not exist at all, and from 1750 till 1839 only in "a most corrupt condition."

[*To be continued.*]

28 34 28

DR. MCGLYNN'S RESTORATION AND THE SINGLE TAX THEORY.

(II.—*Conclusion.*)

From the Washington despatch of January 14th, 1893, already quoted, we learn the following facts:

1. Msgr. Satolli reconciled Dr. McGlynn by special power granted by the Holy Father.
2. Dr. McGlynn received absolution from ecclesiastical censures because he accepted the conditions laid down for him by the Holy Father as necessary and sufficient; viz.:
3. Dr. McGlynn presented a statement of his opinions and it was judged not contrary to the teaching of the Church and of the encyclical "Rerum Novarum."
4. Dr. McGlynn professed his adherence to all the doctrines of the Church and expressed his regret for any word or act of his

that might have seemed lacking in the respect due to ecclesiastical authority.

5. Dr. McGlynn promised to go to Rome in due time and in the proper spirit.

From his statement made at the meeting of Jan. 15th, 1893, also quoted in our last, we learn the following facts :

1. Dr. McGlynn had presented a letter to the Apostolic Delegate, the acceptance of which was immediately followed by the declaration of the removal of ecclesiastical censures.

2. By the publication of this letter at the meeting, the Doctor wished to reaffirm the sentiments contained therein.

3. He had learned with satisfaction that it had been judged that there was nothing contrary to Catholic teaching in his doctrine, as explained in his exposition of the same.

4. He assured the Apostolic Delegate that he had never consciously said a word contrary to the Church's teaching, nor consciously failed in the respect due to the Holy See.

5. The Doctor expressed his full adhesion to the teachings of the Church and notably to those contained in the encyclical "Rerum Novarum."

6. As to the journey to Rome he was willing to make it within three or four months.

These are all the facts contained in the two documents. Where is there a declaration of "ecclesiastical authority," from "the Holy See," from "the Church"?

The Washington despatch authorized by Msgr. Satolli says that "the brief statement of the Doctor's opinions on moral-economic matters was judged not contrary to Catholic teaching." Dr. McGlynn himself writes in his letter to the Apostolic Delegate simply : "I am very happy to learn that it has been judged that there is nothing contrary," etc. "It was judged,"—"it has been judged,"—by whom ? By the Apostolic Delegate ? If this had been the case, the Washington despatch, or, at least, Dr. McGlynn himself, would have mentioned it. The expression, "it was or has been judged," especially when compared with the phrase, "Msgr. Satolli had absolved from censure and reconciled Dr. McGlynn"; and again, "I rejoice that you are prepared to remove the ecclesiastical censures," rather indicates that the "judgment" concerning Dr. McGlynn's doctrine did not proceed from the Apostolic Delegate.

Moreover, it would have been impossible for Msgr. Satolli to examine and decide the doctrinal part of the McGlynn case himself. He had but recently come to this country and was not yet sufficiently acquainted with its language to read the publications of Henry George or similar works. He had not followed the Henry

George controversy which had been carried on in this country for the last ten years and which had excited the minds of Henry George's followers as well as of his opponents in a degree that can only be compared with the excitement caused by the unhappy Catholic school controversy which just at that time was in full blaze. Besides, the Apostolic Delegate was kept busy with many other intricate and annoying affairs. In truth, he was not in a position to judge for himself of the doctrine advocated by Dr. McGlynn, but was forced to consign this task to others. And this he did.

In the New York *Freeman's Journal*, whose reliability in this matter admits of no doubt, we read in the issue of Dec. 5th, 1903 :

"On the arrival of Archbishop Satolli in this country as the Pope's representative, appeal was made to him to reverse the act of excommunication against Dr. McGlynn. He suggested that Dr. McGlynn should fully state and explain his doctrine on the land question. The Doctor presented to the Alegate a direct and explicit statement of his teaching, just as he had been teaching it from the beginning. His presentation of the George land theory was submitted to and carefully considered by a committee [four in number] of the professors of the Catholic University in Washington, who . . . declared that it contained nothing contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church . . . On this decision Archbishop Satolli, in formal words, and in the name of the Pope, removed the ban of excommunication from Dr. McGlynn, and the first announcement of the Doctor's reinstatement was made by the papal representative from the Catholic University at Washington. Previous to the removal of the ban Dr. McGlynn had expressly stipulated that he should be free to continue to expound the Single Tax as long as he thought proper."

Again, in the issue of the same journal, of Jan. 23d, 1904, we read:

"When [our correspondent] carries his interpretation so far as to say the encyclical condemns the Single Tax doctrine he comes in collision with the judgment and official decision of those learned professors to whom a statement of the doctrine was submitted by Msgr. Satolli, the Pope's representative. With the greatest regard for [his] ability and learning, we are constrained to prefer the official interpretation of those university professors which the Pope's representative received and acted upon, and on the basis of which he restored Dr. McGlynn to his ecclesiastical status.

"Msgr. Satolli requested Dr. McGlynn to state the Single Tax doctrine which he advocated. He complied, and his statement was submitted by Msgr. Satolli to the professors of the Catholic University at Washington. Their decision was that they found nothing in the statement contrary to Catholic teaching. As they

included the Encyclical as Catholic teaching, their decision was that there was nothing in the statement of Dr. McGlynn contrary to that papal document. This was accepted as final by the Papal Delegate, and Dr. McGlynn was restored without any retraction or repudiation on his part of the doctrine he had been advocating, and with the understanding that he could continue to advocate it. On the evening of the day on which he said his first Mass after his restoration, he gave a public lecture in which he advocated it."

Finally, on Feb. 6th, 1904, the *Freeman's Journal* wrote under the heading, "The Georgian Land Theory," as follows:

"In compliance with the suggestion [of our correspondent], we give elsewhere in this issue the two statements of the Georgian Land Theory as understood by Dr. McGlynn and Dr. Burtzell. These statements were approved by Henry George, in a letter to the *New York Sun*, as a correct exposition of his land theory. They were submitted to Msgr. Satolli and by him referred to a committee of professors of the Catholic University of Washington and declared by them to contain nothing contrary to Catholic teaching. After this decision was rendered the Papal Delegate removed the excommunication from Dr. McGlynn and restored his faculties."

The *Journal* adds: "These facts, it seems to us, ought definitely to close the question....." Undoubtedly they ought to close it, and we venture to maintain that they do close it. For they make it evident beyond even the possibility of doubt that the judgment which declared the land theory advocated by Dr. McGlynn to contain nothing contrary to Catholic teaching, was not a "declaration from ecclesiastical authority," but the opinion of those professors who were called upon to examine Dr. McGlynn's statement. The learned professors of the Catholic University at Washington acted merely as private theologians. Their decision has, therefore, no other authority than that which utterances of scholars generally have. But after all, did their learning keep the four professors from making a *wrong* decision? Alas! it did not. Their decision is so manifestly erroneous that it has always been and is still a mystery how they could arrive at it.

We have demonstrated by a minute and accurate examination of the tenets of Henry George and of Dr. McGlynn that their doctrine is substantially the same. We have demonstrated that their whole economic teaching is essentially embodied in the statement: there is no private, but only common ownership in land. We have, finally, demonstrated that this doctrine is openly in conflict with natural reason, with the explicit teaching of Leo XIII., and with Holy Scripture.*) The opinion, therefore, of the professors who

*) See THE REVIEW, Vol. xi, Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 38, 40, and 41.

pronounced the Henry George-McGlynn Land Theory to contain nothing contrary to the teaching of the Church, has no value whatever. And in the reinstatement of Dr. McGlynn, as well as in the events connected with it, there is nothing that could in truth be construed as a doctrinal decision or judgment from any ecclesiastical authority. The action of the Apostolic Delegate in the McGlynn case was of a merely disciplinary character. Hence the true reply to the question we intended to answer by our series of papers is and remains :

The Single Tax Theory is not an open question for Catholics.

✕ ✕ ✕

MINOR TOPICS.

In Favor of a Catholic Daily.—Rev. L. Verhaag writes to THE REVIEW: The experiment, which, with proper management, must prove a successful one, of starting a daily newspaper on Catholic principles, will be made, if necessary conditions are fulfilled, in the beginning of next year by the *Volksfreund* of Buffalo, N. Y. The capital required is only \$125,000, at \$5 per share, and no money shall be payable until \$100,000 is subscribed, which must be on or before January 1st, 1905. The money subscribed is to be paid as follows: 10% at the start and then 10% every month until the full amount is paid. The stock is unassessable and no further obligations are incurred. We have it from Mr. James G. Smith of the *Volksfreund*, who has undertaken this work, that there is absolutely no chance to water the stock. At the yearly meeting every stockholder will have a voice in the proper management, etc., of the paper. The stockholders will also share in the dividends of the *Volksfreund*, now successfully established for more than thirty-six years.

The field of a good daily newspaper, based on correct moral principles and ready to take up the defense of our holy faith whenever attacked, is still uncultivated in this broad land of ours with its twelve millions of Catholics, and as a business venture, not to speak of its moral power, it must become, with care and proper management, a financial success in the not distant future.

Buffalo may not be the best place to start such a paper, but where is the other city in the U. S. which has thus far made an active move toward the accomplishment of such a venture? We must give credit to Buffalo and chiefly to the proprietors of the Buffalo *Volksfreund*, for having started this movement at a great personal sacrifice. Shall the effort of the *Volksfreund* be perhaps frustrated on account of that unfortunate spirit of nationalism? Shall our weekly Catholic papers, who will benefit by a good reliable daily paper, act the part of the dog in the manger, and oppose such a movement? It is a blot on the zeal of our Catholics, and this means clergy and laity, to be without a daily paper in this age of advancement and progress. But enough has been said

on this subject. We need action, action, action. Let all priests and laymen who read these lines send at once, without delay, their names as stockholders to James G. Smith, 48 Broadway, Buffalo, N. Y. We have less than two months left to test the plan and as yet not one-half of the capital has been subscribed. Remember that, if \$100,000 are not subscribed by January, 1905, the plan will be abandoned, and not soon again, if ever, my poor voice, which has been crying in the wilderness for these three years past, will be raised in the advocacy of a Catholic daily newspaper. For the sake of example, and I may add, as an investment, I have subscribed \$200 to the stock. Can not 500 more persons be found among the Catholic clergy and laity of the U. S. who will do the same? (REV.) L. VERHAAG.

Apostasy of Mary Gwendolin Caldwell.—On Nov. 15th, the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* printed an Associated Press telegram from New York, announcing the formal apostasy of the Marquise des Monstiers de Merinville, who, as Miss Mary Gwendolin Caldwell, in 1884 by a large gift of money (\$300,000) made possible the establishment of the "Catholic University of America" at Washington. The Marquise, in a public statement, was quoted thus:

"Yes, it is true that I have left the Roman Catholic Church. Since I have been living in Europe my eyes have been opened to what that Church really is and to its anything but sanctity. But the trouble goes much further back than this. Being naturally religious, my imagination was early caught by the idea of doing something to lift the Church from the lowly position which it occupied in America, so I thought of a university or higher school where its clergy could be educated and if possible refined. Of course, in this I was greatly influenced by Bishop Spalding, of Peoria, who represented it to me as one of the greatest works of the day. When I was 21 I turned over to them one-third of my fortune for that purpose. But for years I have been trying to rid myself of the subtle yet overwhelming influence of a Church which pretends not only to the privilege of being 'the only true church,' but of being alone able to open the gates of heaven to a sorrowful, sinful world. At last my honest Protestant blood has asserted itself, and I now forever repudiate and cast off the yoke of Rome."

It is sad to hear such words from her of whom Bishop Spalding said in a well-known lecture: "How shall I more fittingly conclude than with the name of her whose generous heart and enlightened mind were the impulse which has given to what long had been hope deferred and a dreamlike vision, existence and a dwelling-place,—Mary Gwendolen Caldwell." ('Education and the Higher Life,' p. 210.)

We suppose that name will have to be erased from the University's 'Year-Book' and "Caldwell Divinity Hall" renamed.

Poor University! When will thy tribulations end?

Charity and State Supervision.—State Boards of Charity or Correction exist, according to a report read at the Portland meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, in the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland,

Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and Montana.

The report says: "Theoretically, at least, it would seem that the administration or control of charitable institutions should be left to those citizens to be found in every community, who are able, willing, and anxious to help their fellow-men for the sake of humanity. Boards so composed may spend money more freely; but the greater part of the money thus spent would be for a good purpose, and a central advisory board, whose recommendation would be necessary for yearly appropriations, should act as an effective check on wastefulness. The system of centralized control appears to check philanthropic efforts or real charity to a considerable extent; in other words, public-spirited citizens are thereby eliminated from the service they would be glad to render to humanity, and the whole matter reduced to the cold level of official action. If we are to believe the reports made, and there is no reason to doubt their accuracy, politicians, as such, commonly keep their hands off the management of charitable institutions. There seems to be a determined and wholesome effort on the part of the people to keep professional politicians from trading on the unfortunate inmates of such institutions.

"How far State supervision of private charities is justified, is an interesting question. The States generally appear to hesitate to exercise any oversight, and the managers of the private charities, while they may not resent supervision, do not invite it. There is some danger of going too far in giving power to the State, and the laws regulating charity should not be permitted to override personal rights. It will probably be agreed that where institutions are established to care for persons too ignorant or incompetent to look after themselves, the public is interested in the management of such institutions, and the State should have the right to visit and inspect them, whether supported by public money or not."

Catholic Women as Voters.—Our readers will remember the remarks we made about a year ago on the apparent failure of woman suffrage in Australia. Recently another election was held there, in which, according to the *Sydney Catholic Press* (Aug. 11th), while it brought a great many women to the polls and was, generally, quite "satisfactory to the friends of female suffrage," the Catholic women did not cover themselves with glory. "In recording the gratifying vote polled by woman," says our far-away contemporary, "we can not congratulate our Catholic women upon the part they played. We believe they availed themselves of their privilege to a greater extent than at the last election, but at the same time far too many held aloof from this election altogether. They had repeated warnings as to the results likely to follow any indifference on their part. It was pointed out that by not voting they probably gave two votes to the enemy of their happiness and social welfare. Yet thousands of them stayed away, whilst their Protestant neighbors tied on their bonnets and hastened down the street to vote with their brothers and husbands. Our rabid opponents have very little to boast about as the result of the elec-

tions. Some of the greatest pets of the Orange lodges were sent to the retirement of private life, whilst the Labor candidates were splendidly successful. Yet had our women done their duty, the Labor party and the government might have been still stronger, whilst Parliament closed its doors against yet another brace or so of sectarian howlers. By leaving politics to the men, our women have become the greatest enemies of their own households, and it is almost inconceivable that they continue to persist in tactics which must inevitably prove their own undoing. Amongst the swarms of well-dressed women who went laughing and chatting to some of the polls, only one out of every three or four had a Catholic name."

The Independent Voter.—The most striking feature of our recent election, next to the tremendous majorities for Roosevelt, is the extent of the independent voting. As details are published, the results grow more impressive. At last, as the *Washington Post* puts it, the American voter has solved the mystery of the Australian ballot. There have been split tickets before, but not on such a large scale. Although President Roosevelt's immense popularity no doubt tempted many Democrats to vote, for his sake, the straight Republican ticket, and although Republican partisans must have been unusually reluctant to run any risks by cutting, yet we have four Democratic governors in States carried by Roosevelt—Folk in Missouri, Douglas in Massachusetts, Johnson in Minnesota, and Adams in Colorado. In three other States, Rhode Island, New York, and Washington, there was a wide discrepancy between the Republican vote for national and State candidates. It is not necessary to argue that in all cases the voters were guided by wisdom. The significant fact is that they discriminated between national and local issues, and voted on each according to their convictions. One of the advantages of the Australian ballot, next to its secrecy, is the power it gives a reasonably intelligent voter to cut loose from party trammels. He may be a Democrat or a Republican; but he is no longer compelled to condone all the crimes committed by the organization, to endorse every rascal whom it puts up for office. Such is the theory of the ballot, and such, after a long and often discouraging period of experimentation, is coming to be the practice with regard to it. In many of the States the day when either party would dare to rely on its "fine brute majority" and put forward a "yellow dog" candidate, is clearly, and we hope forever, past.

L'Oeuvre des Eglises Pauvres.—THE REVIEW has repeatedly given unstinted praise to the noble work performed by the Tabernacle Societies of Philadelphia and Cincinnati in supplying poor churches with the necessary vestments; but greater praise is due to the Belgian society mentioned above, which, under the presidency of the Countess de Meus, has furnished to poor American missions, since 1861, things needed for the altar to the extent of nearly \$80,000. Every priest ordained at Louvain for the American mission has been given an outfit consisting of several vestments, a chalice, missal, etc., the value of which amounted altogether to \$38,677. But outside of this the society, chiefly at the suggestion of the Rector of the American College at Louvain, sent out other goods to poor

missions in this country amounting to \$39,095. "A free gift of nearly \$80,000 from little Belgium to the Church in America," says the *American College Bulletin* (II. 4) from which we have culled the figures above, "is well worth mentioning in these pages."



—The "Fresh Air Work" of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in New York, as described in a paper read by Rev. Dr. McMahon at the international conference of the Society recently held in St. Louis, is deserving of mention in *THE REVIEW*. This work began in 1899 and aims to give the poor neglected Catholic urchins of the metropolis, who live on the street or in unsanitary tenements, a few weeks' recreation each summer in the pure air of the country, among surroundings conducive to faith and good morals. The Society now has a spacious farm near the metropolis, with suitable buildings, where 1,500 children were this summer given the benefit of a two weeks' outing. The cost of the work is not large, about \$1.50 per child weekly. The children attend mass every Sunday; catechism classes are conducted throughout the season; many children were taught their prayers for the first time; others were prepared for and made their first confession.

—The *Wichita Catholic Advance* continues to advertise our humble *REVIEW* in its own spirited and charitable fashion. Responding to some one's query: "Who has the highest authority to decide questions about the Catholic Church—I mean in America? Is it, perhaps, Cardinal Gibbons, or the Apostolic Delegate, or the Catholic University?" it says in its No. 31, vol. V.: "We hate to give the thing away but Arthur Preuss, editor of the St. Louis *REVIEW*, can be consulted profitably on all questions from conic sections to sour milk. He is especially sound on anything sour. We know no higher authority. Cardinal Satolli attempted to usurp Dr. Preuss' perch on the ladder to eminence, especially on the question of the Knights of Columbus, but the Cardinal was promptly squelched in two numbers of his little blunderbuss."

—An early attempt to establish the Franciscan Order in this country was made in 1804 by Rev. Michael Egan. He got the permission of Rome and negotiated for land in Kentucky for the purpose of establishing a convent, but never realized his plan. In 1808 Father Egan, who was himself an Irish Franciscan, was appointed first Bishop of Philadelphia. He died in 1814. Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin has published his life.

—Walter Williams, the well-known Missouri editor, in an address to Missouri University students on "Why Study the Bible?" characterized the Gospel of St. Luke as the best text-book of journalism to be had. "Luke," he said, "is always clear, courteous, truthful—first lessons to be learned by the young journalist."

—The librarian of Notre Dame University would like to complete his files of *THE REVIEW* and requests us to ask those of our readers who may be disposed to part with old volumes or odd numbers, to write to him. His address is: Prof. James F. Edwards, Notre Dame University, South Bend, Ind.

